

# The Church in Christianity

Bonnell Spencer, O.H.C.



THE LIBRARY  
THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE  
CATHEDRAL HEIGHTS  
NEW YORK 25, N. Y.

A ROODCROFT PAPER

Holy Cross Press

West Park, N. Y.

# The Church In Christianity

WHEN I was invited to address this group on religion, the choice of the specific subject was left largely in my hands. I found it a difficult decision to make. I realized that my audience would be composed of members of many Christian groups, and perhaps some who do not actively participate in any Christian group. I knew that I was not being invited to expound to you the specific doctrines of the Christian group to which I belong.

On the other hand, I am a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I have been a member of that Church since I was baptized at the age of four weeks. My religious training, both as a child and later as a young man preparing for the ministry,

---

*This Paper was originally given as an address to the Town Forum at Sherman, Texas.*

has been given exclusively by the Episcopal Church. All I know about the Christian religion at first hand is what the Episcopal Church teaches. I could hardly speak intelligently about what I do not know.

One possible solution of my dilemma would have been to select some very general topic on which it might be hoped all Christians, indeed all men of goodwill, might agree. But there was a strong objection to this. Any such topic would have to be most vague and general. On it one could hope only to utter a few pious platitudes. An address on such a subject could well be summarized in Calvin Coolidge's remarks on a sermon he had heard. When asked what the preacher had talked about, he answered, "Sin." "And what did the preacher say?" "He was against it." It would not be worth your effort to attend this forum tonight, if I were to say no more than that.

Furthermore I doubt that there is a subject, however general, on which we could all agree. I presume we are all against sin. But are we all in agreement as to what constitutes a sin? I doubt it. I am reasonably certain that the Churches to which some of you belong teach that some things are

sins, which I not only believe to be innocent pleasure. Indeed, I consider it a most serious sin, the sin of moral heresy, to declare them to be sinful. Hence I do not believe there is a subject, connected however vaguely with religion and presented however generally, on which we would be in full agreement.

Therefore I decided to take the exact opposite course. Instead of trying to avoid a controversial subject, I determined to take the bull by the horns, or perhaps I should say to take the dilemma by the horns, and to choose as my topic one of the most controversial issues facing modern Christendom—the place of the Church in Christianity. Difference of opinion on that subject is what split Christendom in the 16th century. Difference of opinion on it is what keeps Christendom divided today. Each Christian group has as a part of its heritage, I firmly believe, some aspect of the nature and place of the Church. It is the paramount duty of that Christian group to be true to its heritage. Yet its very loyalty to that aspect of the truth tends to make it blind to the truth held by other Christian groups, to deny their truth, and thus to remain separate from and hostile to them,

I SHALL approach this subject frankly from the point of view of the Church to which I belong. I should be guilty of being untrue to the heritage which I have received were I to do otherwise. Yet in approaching the subject from the point of view of the Episcopal Church, I hope I can present it in such a way as will be fair to all Christian groups. That may sound like a presumptuous hope—the hope that one Christian group can present a subject on which all Christian groups are most completely at variance in such a way as will be fair to all the others. Perhaps the hope is presumptuous. That will be for you to judge when I have finished. But with your indulgence I shall make the effort to fulfill it.

The reason I believe it possible for an Episcopalian to speak with some hope of impartiality on the place of the Church in Christianity is the unique position the Episcopal Church has in relation to the division of the Church in the 16th century. We believe that, unlike all the other Churches which separated from the Pope at that time, we alone have retained all the essential elements of the One Holy Catholic Church as it existed for the first sixteen centuries. In other words

we claim to be just as Catholic as the Roman Catholic Church. On the other hand, we did take part in the Reformation, and the Church of England, of which the Episcopal Church is an autonomous branch, was greatly changed by it. We believe that we adopted all the sound and beneficial reforms that were advocated by the Protestant leaders. In other words, we claim to be as thoroughly reformed as any Protestant group.

I do not ask you to grant either of these claims to be correct on my say-so. I do not even ask you to investigate them to determine their worth. It is not my purpose to assert, still less to prove, that the Episcopal Church is right. I refer to those claims merely to demonstrate why I believe that an Episcopalian can approach the question of the place of the Church in Christianity with some degree of impartiality. The most fundamental disagreement today as to the nature of the Church, and therefore as to its place in Christianity, is between Catholics and Protestants. The Episcopal Church has kept in touch with the thought of both Catholics and Protestants on the subject. It is, therefore, in a position to understand sympathetically both sides of the controversy.

Perhaps even that is to claim too much. The Church is composed of individuals and few, if any, individuals have succeeded in comprehending the inclusive position which the Episcopal Church has tried to maintain. Some are drawn to one side of the controversy; others to the other. It should be obvious to you that I, a monk, who try to live the same kind of life and keep the same vows as monks of the Roman Church, am more in sympathy with our Catholic, than with our Reformation heritage. Yet there are many other priests of our Church who are just as enthusiastically sympathetic with the most extreme form of Protestantism. We are constantly meeting in Church gatherings. We have to learn to tolerate each other's points of view. We have to formulate a common policy. Therefore although we may not fully sympathize with each other's positions, we are forced to be aware of them and to adapt ourselves to them. Years of such experience do make one somewhat understanding of the values of both sides of the controversy.

With that by way of preamble let us now see if we can find a definition of the Church broad enough to include both the Catholic and Protestant emphases. I hope we can. I suggest the following:

the Church is a society formed by God, to which and through which He can reveal Himself. It is a society, not a mere collection of individuals, but an organized social group. It is formed by God. God creates it by bringing men and women into a definite relationship to Himself. The purpose of that relationship is to reveal Himself to those who respond, and to send them forth as His agents to draw others into the same relationship with Himself.

That definition would seem to include both the Catholic and Protestant definitions of the Church. The favorite Catholic synonym for the Church is the Body of Christ, the continuation of His human nature. It is an *organism* created by God and related to Christ as our bodies are related to our minds. As such it has a definite and ascertainable structure. Through its official teaching the voice of Christ speaks to every age. In its sacraments Christ takes material things—water, bread, wine, oil—and uses them as channels of His power and grace. The essence of the Catholic attitude toward the Church is an emphasis on externals, because the Catholic is chiefly interested in the Church as the means through which Christ can continue to

speak and act on earth in such a way that He can be seen and heard.

The Protestant thinks of the Church chiefly as the fellowship of the elect. It is composed only of those who have been called, chosen, converted, predestined to salvation—various groups would use different words. But clearly they all mean that the Church is a society formed by God. Those who make up the Church are they who have received and understood the revelation of God through faith and given themselves to Him to be used in the service of others. The keynote of the Protestant emphasis is sincerity. None can be counted as members of the Church who merely belong to some earthly organization and who merely give lip-service or blind submission to the Gospel and perform perfunctory ritual acts. The marks of a Christian are real conversion, vital faith, and practical application of the Gospel to daily living. Since only the individual himself, and God who looketh on the heart of man can judge a man's sincerity, the Church, according to Protestantism, is not a visible society, but an invisible fellowship of the elect known only to God.

If then the definition which we have proposed—

that the Church is a society formed by God to which and through which He can reveal Himself —is sufficiently broad to include both the Catholic and Protestant concepts, let us now turn to the Bible and see what evidence we can find for the existence of such a Church and for its place in Christianity.

The first thing that we notice is that the Church in this sense is older than Christianity. The Jews of the Old Testament times were a society formed by God to which and through which He revealed Himself. They were *chosen* People, the race and nation that God had selected and brought into a special relationship to Himself in order that He might prepare them for His coming in Christ.

When man sinned he lost his knowledge of God, not entirely of course, but it was distorted. Instead of believing in the one God, Creator of heaven and earth, men made for themselves many gods in their own image, sort of supermen, with mere human interests, limitations, and even human vices. Before God Himself could come to earth to redeem man, He had to prepare a people who would know Him well enough to recognize Him.

For this purpose He chose the Jews, beginning

in the time of Abraham to reveal Himself to them. The process of God's self-revelation and preparation of the Jews was bound to take time—many centuries in fact. During this period of preparation, the Jews had to be kept a people apart, not only especially related to God, but also separated from the other races of mankind. Otherwise their special revelation would not have been passed on from generation to generation. It would have been contaminated by the pagan religions that surrounded them.

Therefore God gave the Jews a law. Part of this law was the moral code designed to make the Jews a holy people of a holy God. But part of the law was ceremonial, elaborate customs of eating, drinking, dress, restrictions as to marriage, etc., the purpose of which was to make the Jews so different from their neighbors that there would be the least possible contact with them. God also gave the Jews one temple at Jerusalem, the only place where sacrifice would be offered to the one God.

Thus the Jewish Church not only fulfilled the general definition of a church. It also had the externals which the Catholic emphasizes. It had its definite and official teaching, its rites, ceremonies

and forms of worship. Its membership was clearly limited and defined.

All Jews, however, who were members of this Church and who kept its external requirements, were not thereby brought automatically into the right relationship with God. Human sin entered into the picture and turned the externals of the Jewish religion into occasions for selfishness. Some Jews looked upon their position as members of the Chosen People as a matter of special privilege. They both considered themselves assured of salvation and were scornful of the Gentiles, merely because they were Jews. They used their performance of the ceremonial law as the basis for *demanding* God's favor and support. They elaborated the ritual at the expense of the moral law.

It was, therefore, necessary to remind the Jews again and again that membership in the Jewish Church, lip-service to its beliefs, and external compliance to its ritual were not enough. There must be sincere belief, sincere worship, sincere self-oblation of God. This introduces the aspect of the Church which the Protestants emphasize. From time to time God sent the prophets to call the Jews to repentance and to sincere devotion to God.

When the prophets were unheeded, God visited disaster upon the Jews to destroy the selfish distortions they had erected and to separate out the faithful remnant through whom His work of revelation and preparation could be continued.

In the end only a few Jews had profited from the long centuries of preparation sufficiently well to recognize and follow Christ when He came. The others had so distorted the law to their selfish advantage that when God came they not only did not recognize Him, they actually put Him to death as a blasphemer against God's law. Although He was their long-expected Messiah, the leaders and most of the Jewish people rejected Him. Once more God had to separate out the sincere and faithful remnant. Christ gathered about Him His disciples. He gave them special instructions as to God's nature and God's will. He provided them with certain ceremonies like Baptism and Holy Communion. He selected and commissioned the Twelve Apostles who were to be the official teachers of the Gospel, the ministers of the sacraments and the leaders of the new Church which He organized to carry on His work.

**T**HE Christian Church was first organized, then, by drawing out of the whole body of the Jews, who were formally members of the ancient Church and who were keeping its external requirements, only those who were truly faithful and sincere. They were the called, the chosen, the elect. By forming them into a fellowship with each other and with Him, Christ established His Church.

Yet in so doing, Christ did not repudiate the external side of the Church. As He said, He came to fulfill both the law and the prophets. He and His disciples were Jews, strictly faithful to the law. This has been somewhat obscured for us by the fact that our Lord's *opponents* came chiefly from the officials of the Jewish Church and He had with them a series of disputes about keeping the law. This has been interpreted as meaning that Christ rejected the organization and the law as being foreign to His Gospel.

If we look more closely, however, we shall see that this was not so. It is true that the Pharisees were eager to discredit Christ by proving that He and His followers failed to keep the law. They scrutinized His life with care and did succeed in accusing Him of violating the Sabbath by healing

on it and of one or two other minor infractions. What does this prove? That Christ was indifferent to the law? Not at all. Since this was all the evidence His enemies could muster, it shows how carefully He kept the Jewish law.

The Acts of the Apostles gives further evidence along the same lines. The Apostles had so little idea that Christ had intended in any way to drop the ancient Jewish law that it was only with the greatest difficulty that they were convinced that the Gentiles could become Christians without first becoming Jews. God had to give Peter a miraculous revelation before he would baptize Cornelius the Gentile. Paul had to battle even with Peter before he could convince the Church that Gentile Christians had equal rights with Jewish Christians. It was, of course, Christ's will that the old exclusive law be done away. It had fulfilled its purpose. It has served as a schoolmaster to bring some of the Jews to Christ. But Christ was not opposed to law as such. He provided His Church with its own law and rites and ceremonies.

He also provided it with an organization, a set of officials. The Twelve Apostles were chosen and given special training. To them He committed His

Gospel. They were to be its official guardians and teachers. To them He committed His sacraments. They were to be their ministers. And they were the commissioned leaders of the Church, running its affairs and authorizing their successors. The eleven remaining Apostles appointed Matthias to take the place of Judas. The Apostles ordained the Seven to serve tables. The Bible shows the Apostles acting as the official agents of Christ in ruling His Church.

The Church as our Lord established it not only fulfils our general definition of a church. It also includes both the Catholic and Protestant emphases. It is the Body of Christ, a definite organism with its own internal structure, through which Christ continues to preach the Gospel in definite terms and to act in the sacraments. On the other hand, at least for the first two centuries, it was composed almost exclusively of earnest and sincere followers of Christ. It had to be, because those were days of persecution when men had to be willing to accept torture and death for Christ or they fell by the way. The Church insisted on the highest standards and those who did not conform were promptly expelled.

Such, then, was the Church as Christ established it. What was its place in Christianity? It was the organ, and the only organ, Christ left on earth to carry on His work. Many forget that today. Just last week I heard a man say, "We must reverence Christianity and the Book on which it was founded." Christianity was not founded on a book. Christ did not give us a book. He gave us the Church. His teaching, as far as we know, was entirely oral. He never wrote a word, or if He did, none of His writings have survived.

Christ established the Church as the means by which He could continue His work on earth. It was the Church that wrote the New Testament. The oldest book of the New Testament was not written until about 25 years after Christ ascended into heaven. Several of the authors of books of the New Testament—Mark, Luke, Paul—were not members of the original Twelve Apostles. They were second generation Christians. The New Testament was originally written in Greek, the language of the early Church, not in Aramaic, the language that Christ spoke.

Not only were the books of the New Testament written by members of the Church rather than by

Christ, but the Church decided what books were to be included in the Bible. There were other Gospels written besides those we know, other books of Acts, other Epistles, other Revelations. There was, for example, a Gospel according to Peter. There were the Acts of Paul and Thecla. The Church read these and said, No, they are not to be included in the Bible. On what grounds? Because they did not contain the teaching the Church had received from the Apostles themselves. They did not conform to the tradition. That was the criterion on which the books of the New Testament were judged. Those that were placed in the New Testament were endorsed because they did faithfully reflect the Apostles' teaching.

And they were endorsed in that sense, and in that sense only. The Church did not say that any interpretation anybody could make of any passage in the Bible was a direct revelation from God. The Church endorsed the Bible because it set down the Gospel while it was still fresh in men's minds. But the Church did not *derive* its teaching from the Bible. It *recorded* its teaching in the Bible.

To recognize this is not in any way to disparage the Bible. The Bible is of utmost importance to

Christianity. It is the record of all essentials of the Church's teaching. Nothing is to be declared a necessary part of the Christian religion if it cannot be proven from the Bible. But the converse is not true. Everything that can be proven from the Bible is not necessarily a direct revelation from God. Any document can be used to prove many, often contradictory things. Only that interpretation which the Church intended when it wrote and endorsed the Bible is to be taken as authentic. Christianity is not a religion of a book. It is the religion of the living Christ who continues to speak and act on earth through the Church, through the society, formed by God, to which and through which God reveals Himself.

That, at least, is what Christianity was like when Christ gave it to us. That is the position occupied by the Church as reflected by the Bible itself. So Christianity was to remain for fifteen centuries. The worship of the Church centered in the Sunday celebration of Holy Communion. The ministry of the Church consisted of bishops, priests and deacons, together with certain minor orders. Ordination to the ministry was exclusively in the hands of the bishops. The Faith of the Church was more

and more clearly defined in the Creeds and in the decisions of the Councils. Moral and canon law was codified. The Church survived the persecutions, took over the Roman Empire, survived its collapse and built up the great medieval civilization.

**T**HERE was a tendency for the external side of the Church to become more elaborate. In the thirteenth century scholastic theology, a magnificent achievement of human thought, solidified into a rigid system. Church law became very complicated. The organization of the Church had grown increasingly complex, with archbishops supervising bishops. In the East, Antioch and Alexandria, and later Constantinople became patriarchates, dividing the government of the Eastern Church between them until the first two were wiped out by the Mohammedans. In the West, the Bishop of Rome became sole ruler of the Church, and claimed jurisdiction over the Eastern Church as well. The refusal of Constantinople to recognize the Pope's claims led to the first great split in the Church in 1054, which has resulted in the separation of

the Eastern and Western Churches right down to the present day.

Yet with all this elaboration of the externals, the internals never completely died out. Each generation had its saints, men and women of unlimited devotion and sincerity. Many of them not only themselves lived lives of simple faith and devotion, but they also started widespread renewals of Church life. Perhaps the most famous of these was St. Francis of Assisi, who went back to a direct and almost painfully literal following of the Gospel precepts. He sold all that he had and gave to the poor, devoting himself from thenceforth to the care of their bodies and souls. He was particularly eager to instruct the ignorant in the great truths of the Christian Faith, so that they might make an intelligent and sincere response. He had thousands of disciples, and through them a wave of devotion and revival swept the 13th century Church. It would be hard to find a man who typified Protestant ideals more clearly than St. Francis. This has been recognized by many great Protestant writers, such as Sabatier, who wrote his life. But St. Francis was always faithful at the same time to the externals of the Church. He had the sincerest belief

in the Church's Faith, deep respect for the clergy, revering their office when the men themselves were unworthy, unshakable devotion to the sacraments, and he was careful to get the Pope's approval before embarking on a major undertaking.

Such a combination of personal zeal and integrity, wide sympathy and tolerance, adventurous gaiety (he was known as the troubadour of God), and absolute faithfulness to the Faith, law sacraments and authorities of the Church is impossible for us to imagine today. The elements of that combination have been largely separated since the Reformation.

It is impossible for us in this paper to go into the causes of the Reformation or to attempt an evaluation of it. For our purpose it will be enough if we recognize two truths on which I think we can all agree. First, that the reformation of the Church in the 16th century was sorely needed. We need no further proof of this than the fact that every Christian group in the West, including of course the Roman Catholics, undertook and carried through a reformation at that time. Second, that the division of Christendom which resulted from the Reformation is a great evil. The quarrels, even

wars, between Christians have been a scandal to the Church. Rivalry between Christian groups has led to unseemly competition. But most serious of all has been the emphasis that each group has put on certain aspects of Christian truth and the repudiation of those aspects held by others. This has led to many types of partial Christianity. This situation has lasted for so long that most of us have lost all concept of the value of those elements of Christianity which are not part of our tradition. We are so conscious of the abuses which follow from an over-emphasis of them by other Christian groups that we think of them as wholly evil.

**P**ROTESTANTISM, as its name implies, arose as a protest against the abuses of the late mediæval Church. Such a protest was long overdue. Christianity had degenerated into a situation where a corrupt and greedy hierarchy was using all means fair and foul to extract money from an ignorant people. The average Christian knew almost nothing about his religion. He was encouraged to believe that if he performed certain ritual acts, believed certain superstitions and above all paid certain

fees, he would be saved, regardless of his moral character and quite apart from any real life of prayer, worship or faith.

Protestantism sought to instil in men a real personal moral integrity. It condemned the magical use of superstitious practices. In this it unquestionably went too far, destroying genuine and legitimate aids to devotion, instead of merely correcting their misuse. I say unquestionably because most Protestant groups today are gradually restoring many of the adjuncts to worship which their forefathers threw out of the Church. But it is easy for a reform movement to go too far and there was great need for the simplification of Church life which Protestantism effected. In order to assure that high moral standards were maintained, Protestantism recognized as real members of the Church only those who are truly converted, have genuine faith, and are assured of salvation. The Church is the fellowship of the elect.

One basic evil of medieval church life which Protestantism recognized and corrected was the impossibility for the average Christian to participate intelligently in faith and worship. Latin was the language of the medieval church, and the com-

mon man did not understand it. The Bible was to him a closed book. The Mass was mumbo-jumbo. Protestantism translated the Bible and the services of the Church into the language of the people. It stressed congregational participation in worship, and emphasized the preaching of the Gospel. All this was a great gain. It allowed people to have a real concept of Christianity, to share in its life, to make an intelligent personal response of faith. This was and is one of the glories of Protestantism.

It had its dangers, of course. By putting the Bible in the hands of people who were not trained to understand it, there was the danger that men would abandon the Church's interpretation of the Bible for some notions of their own. The present divisions of Protestantism are due to the failure to safeguard adequately against this danger.

Yet there is a positive value in familiarity with the Bible which Roman Catholics have been slow to recognize. To read the Bible frequently is a real aid to the spiritual life. A thorough knowledge of God's preparation for Christ as recorded in the Old Testament, an intimacy with our Lord's life as portrayed in the Gospels, an insight into the life and teaching of the early Church, all these make

a contribution to an intelligent faith and a personal love of God. Through meditation on the Scriptures God can speak to our hearts. We can know and respond to Him.

Another strong point of Protestantism is the willingness to let the congregation participate in managing church affairs. Again this can be carried too far. But in principle it is a return to the practice of the early Church, where the local congregation elected its own bishop and settled many of its own problems. Protestantism at its best trusts the common man. This is a true insight and has produced as its by-products the democratic system of government and the determination to provide free education for all. These are achievements of which Protestantism should be proud.

Catholicism, on the other hand, has preserved values which have been largely lost in Protestantism. It has, for instance, insisted on the authority of the Church in matters of faith and morals. Christ, says the Catholic, entrusted His revelation to the Church and it is for the Church to teach and interpret it. The Roman Catholics, in an attempt to give the most clear-cut and definite expression to this, have declared the Pope to be the infallible

Vicar of Christ on earth. This extreme position involves real dangers. It sets up a dictatorship that usurps the rights not only of the average Christian but even of the bishops. It leads to a blind submission which tends to destroy a sense of personal moral and intellectual responsibility. When a man has only to believe and do what he is told, there is always the temptation to feel relieved from the responsibility of thinking for himself, and to conclude that he can do anything he can get away with. I think it may be gravely questioned whether the Roman Church has completely avoided these dangers, especially in places where it is in full and unrivalled control. Yet the authority of the Church—not necessarily of one individual, like the Pope—but of the Church as a whole is a truth essential to Christianity. There must be some way of finding out what God's revelation really means and only the Church itself can tell us that with the full authority of Christ.

Another and perhaps the most important value preserved by Catholicism is the sacramental system. As this has become almost completely foreign to Protestant thought, perhaps we should do well to make a real effort to understand it. The Catholic

concept of the sacraments starts with the fact that God became man in Christ. God took a human nature in order that He could reach us on our level. We humans communicate with each other through our bodies and the material world. When Christ had a human body in Galilee and Jerusalem He could do just that. You remember I said the Catholic prefers to call the Church the Body of Christ. He thinks of it primarily as the continuation of Christ's human body in which He can still take material things,—water, bread, wine, oil—and use them as the means of communication with us through our bodies.

Thus in the washing of Baptism He cleanses us from sin and makes us members of the Church. In the laying on of hands in Confirmation He strengthens us for Church life. In Holy Communion He feeds us with Himself. In Penance He forgives our sins. In Matrimony He establishes Christian family life. In Unction He heals our bodies or prepares us for death.

In these sacraments Christ needs a person who can speak and act in His name. That person, the minister of the sacrament, has to do things he could not possibly do in his own strength. No man is good

enough, or wise enough, to make Christ present under the forms of bread and wine—really present, mind you, not just present to those who believe, but actually and objectively there. No man is good or wise enough to forgive sin. Only Christ Himself can do these things. The minister is simply His agent. As such he must be commissioned. That is why the Catholic insists on the valid ordination of ministers.

A legal analogy will help us here. If John Doe draws checks on Richard Roe's bank account he commits a crime. But if Richard Roe gives John Doe a power of attorney, authorizing him to do that, then John Doe's checks are valid. They are Richard Roe's checks through his agent John Doe. But it is not enough for John Doe to think Richard Roe wants him to draw such checks, or to feel he is called to draw them. He must have a document, signed and sealed, to authorize him.

In the same way, if a human minister is to act as the agent of Christ, doing things which only Christ Himself can do, he must have an objective authorization. This is given by the sacrament of Holy Orders—ordination by the laying on of hands. The minister of that sacrament must be one whose

own authorization included the power to pass on the authorization to others. The Catholic believes that only bishops are so empowered. That is why he insists on the episcopal ordination of his ministers—ordination by bishops who can trace their authorization right back to the apostles themselves. The whole Catholic concept of sacraments, acts of Christ through His Body the Church, depends on a ministry so authorized.

I AM aware that this paper has wandered over much territory. That should give us plenty of material for discussion. I also realize that I have undoubtedly trampled on many prejudices. That may make the discussion heated. I have probably made many mistakes in my presentation. I make no claim to infallibility. In closing I should like to remind you of what I have been trying to do. I have tried, to the best of my ability, to present as sympathetically as I can some of the values preserved in different Christian traditions. My hope is that we can all learn from each other some of the values our own tradition lacks.

I hope you will take my remarks in the spirit

in which they have been made, that you will make the effort sympathetically to understand each other's traditions. Then I am sure our discussion will not only be fruitful for us, but it will make a real contribution towards what is, I am sure, dear to all our hearts—the reunion of Christendom. For I am convinced that reunion will come, not by our discarding our differences, not by us all agreeing on one partial kind of Christianity, but by us all contributing the positive elements of our traditions to a real and living synthesis. Such a synthesis will become possible when, and only when, we have all learned to appreciate each other's traditions.

# THE HOLY CROSS PRESS

*Publishers of*

## THE HOLY CROSS MAGAZINE MONTHLY

One Year, \$3.00  
Outside U.S.A., \$3.25

© Also Books, Tracts and Pamphlets  
dealing with the Catholic Faith and  
the devotional life. Write for list.

Roodcroft Papers sell for 10c Each.  
Dozen for \$1. One hundred for \$8.

*(Prices subject to change)*

HOLY CROSS PRESS

WEST PARK, N. Y.